LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT

FILED
NOV 14 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

No. 75-719

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR HAWAII and SAMUEL P. KING, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

and

KURT BOYER, RENE CRISANTO LICHAUCO, RUSSELL FRANKLIN BARNETT, JR., MICHAEL PAUL MEYER, JEFFREY FRED CHOY HEE, MITCHELL ANDREW MCCONNELL, DAVID PAUL TURLEY, and THOMAS LEONARD BARTHEL, III, Real Parties in Interest, *Petitioners,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Respondent.*

JOINT PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

THOMAS L. MUI
1131 Pacific Trade Center
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Attorney for Petitioners United States District Court and Samuel P. King, District Judge

DAVID BETTENCOURT
JOHN S. EDMUNDS
ERIC A. SEITZ
Suite 402, 225 Queen Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Attorneys for Petitioners Kurt Boyer, et al.

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS PRINTING, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

INDEX

	Page
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Questions presented	2
Acknowledgment of a pending petition for certiorari in a similar case	2
Statement of facts	3
Reasons for granting the writ	5
I. The Court of Appeals' grant of a Writ of Mandamus, without opinion, reviewing an interlocutory procedural order in a criminal case which could not possibly have had the effect of a dismissal, runs contrary to an express holding of this Court and raises the significant question of what guidelines, if any, a Circuit Court must follow in issuing writs curtailing the power of a District Court	5
II. A federal district court should have the power, free from interference by interlocutory mandamus, to order the appointment of counsel in a criminal case	7
Conclusion	10
Appendices	1a

CITATIONS

CASES:

Austin, et al. v. *United States of America and Hon. Jack B. Weinstein*, No. 74-1170 (1974); cert. denied, —— U.S. ——, 43 L.W. 3674 (6-24-75) . . . 2, 4, 9

De Beers Consol. Mines, Ltd. v. *United States*, 325 U.S. 212, 217 (1945) . . . 6

Page

Ex parte Peterson, 253 U.S. 300, 312, 313 (1920) 8
Ex parte United States, 287 U.S. 241 (1932) 6
Ex parte United States, 242 U.S. 27 (1916) 6
United States of America v. *Hon. Jack B. Weinstein*, 511 F.2d 622 C.A.N.Y. (1975) 5
United States v. *Akutagawa*, Cr. No. 13111 3
United States v. *Allen*, Cr. No. 13062 3
United States v. *Heyns*, Cr. No. 74-116 3
United States v. *Mayer*, 235 U.S. 55 6
United States v. *McKenna*, Cr. No. 12567 3
United States v. *Roth*, Cr. No. 12560 3
United States v. *Smith*, 331 U.S. 469 (1947) 6
United States v. *Woolley*, Cr. No. 12814 3
United States v. *Yiznitsky*, Cr. No. 74-115 3
Will v. *United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 95-96 (1967) ..5, 6, 7, 10

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

No. 75-

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR HAWAII and SAMUEL P. KING, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

and

KURT BOYER, RENE CRISANTO LICHAUCO, RUSSELL FRANKLIN BARNETT, JR., MICHAEL PAUL MEYER, JEFFREY FRED CHOY HEE, MITCHELL ANDREW MCCONNELL, DAVID PAUL TURLEY, and THOMAS LEONARD BARTHEL, III, Real Parties in Interest, *Petitioners,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Respondent.*

JOINT PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

The undersigned attorneys, on behalf of the above-named Petitioners, petition for a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in this case.

OPINIONS BELOW

The various orders of the Court of Appeals (Appendices A, B, C, D and E, *infra*) are not reported. The District Court's unpublished order of December 18, 1974, is Appendix G, page 7a.

JURISDICTION

On June 25, 1975, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit granted the Government's petition for a writ of mandamus requiring the District Court to vacate its order granting appointed counsel access to the selective service files of each of the respective petitioners. A petition and suggestion for rehearing *en banc* was denied on August 18, 1975 (App. E). The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does a court of appeals have power to adjudicate a petition for interlocutory review in a criminal case where the procedural order of the district court could not possibly have the effect of a dismissal?

2, Is it appropriate for a court of appeals to establish an exception to an express holding by the Supreme Court without setting forth any reasons or guidelines therefor?

3. Should a district court have the power, free from interference by interlocutory mandamus, to order the appointment of counsel in a criminal case?

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF A PENDING PETITION FOR CERTIORARI IN A SIMILAR CASE

Petitioners acknowledge the filing by Professor Louis Lusky of a petition for Writ of Certiorari in a related case, viz., *Austin, et al.* v. *United States of America and Hon. Jack B. Weinstein,* No. 74-1170 (1974); cert. denied, —— U.S. ——, 43 L.W. 3674 (6-24-75); petition for rehearing of order denying certiorari presently pending.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On November 6, 1974, the Honorable Samuel P. King (hereinafter Petitioner King) entered a Memorandum and Order appointing three attorneys, David Bettencourt, John S. Edmunds, and Eric A. Seitz, to represent the interests of fifteen persons indicted for alleged selective service violations in the District of Hawaii. (A copy of Petitioner King's Order is contained in Appendix F hereto.)

As Petitioner King stated in his Order:

> In each of the 15 selective service cases pending before this Court[1], the defendants have been indicted but the prosecutions have not gone forward because the defendants are allegedly fugitives. As a result of their allegedly fugitive status, no defense counsel have been representing them. In view of current events[2] this lack of legal representation may prejudice their positions.
>
> (App. F, p. 1)

---

[1] Since the entry of that original order, the following cases were removed from this action; *United States* v. *McKenna*, Cr. No. 12567 (dismissed by the United States Attorney); *United States* v. *Yiznitsky*, Cr. No. 74-115 (defendant has retained other counsel and is awaiting trial); *United States* v. *Woolley*, Cr. No. 12814 (defendant is participating in the President's Clemency Program); *United States* v. *Roth*, Cr. No. 12560, *United States* v. *Akutagawa*, Cr. No. 13111, *United States* v. *Allen*, Cr. No. 13062, and *United States* v. *Heyns*, Cr. No. 74-116 (selective service files in question have been turned over to the attorneys following presentation of signed authorizations).

[2] The particular current event, of which the Court took judicial notice, was the President's announcement and implementation of a Clemency Program for Vietnam era military deserters and selective service violators.

Unlike the *Austin* case, *supra,* the United States Attorney did not object to this appointment of counsel and did not move to vacate said appointment. On December 11, 1974, appointed counsel filed a motion for discovery requesting, *inter alia,* an order permitting them to inspect and/or copy the selective service files in question, which motion was granted after a hearing. The United States Attorney again did not contest the motion for discovery on the grounds that defense counsel should not have been or were improperly appointed.

The compliance date for Respondent-Petitioner King's discovery order of December 18, 1974, was "on or about January 3, 1975." (App. G) The United States Attorney failed to obtain a stay of that order until January 8, 1975, on which date Petitioner King stayed his discovery order pending a petition for mandamus or prohibition to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On January 22, 1975, the Court of Appeals denied the petition for mandamus and prohibition without written opinion (App. A). On January 31, 1975, Petitioner King continued the stay pending a petition for rehearing which was filed in the Court of Appeals on February 2, 1975. On February 13, 1975, the Ninth Circuit Court vacated its former order and allowed responses to the petition to be filed (App. B). Additional briefs were requested and submitted concerning any effect on the litigation resulting from the lapse of the President's Clemency Program.

Thereafter, on June 25, 1975, the Court of Appeals granted the petition for writ of mandamus (App. D) and, as noted above, denied Petitioners' petition and

suggestion for rehearing *en banc* on August 18, 1975 (App. E).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I. The Court of Appeals' grant of a Writ of Mandamus, without opinion, reviewing an interlocutory procedural order in a criminal case which could not possibly have had the effect of a dismissal, runs contrary to an express holding of this Court and raises the significant question of what guidelines, if any, a Circuit Court must follow in issuing writs curtailing the power of a District Court.

In *Will* v. *United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 95-96 (1967) this Court noted it ". . . has never approved the use of the writ [of mandamus] to review an interlocutory procedural order in a criminal case which did not have the effect of a dismissal."

Yet in the present case, the Court of Appeals granted a writ of mandamus under circumstances where it was impossible for the procedural order in question to ". . . have the effect of a dismissal." Id.[3] The Court of Appeals issued a writ of mandamus directing the District Court to "set aside" its order granting discovery of the Defendants' selective service files to their court-appointed counsel (Appendix D). If allowed to stand, the order granting counsel access to these files obviously could not have the effect of a dismissal. Because the Court of Appeals rendered its decision without opinion, it remains unclear how, if at all, that Court

[3] The present action differs in this respect from the situation in *United States of America* v. *Hon. Jack B. Weinstein*, 511 F. 2d. 622 C.A.N.Y. (1975) since Judge Weinstein had entertained motions for dismissal of the indictments made by appointed counsel on behalf of the defendants; it was Judge Weinstein's decisions on such motions that were there the subject of the government's request for mandamus. No such motions have been made in this case nor has Petitioner Judge King indicated whether he will entertain them.

sought to reconcile its decision with the opinion in *Will* v. *United States, supra.* Indeed, the Court of Appeals failed even to find that there had been any judicial "usurpation of power" despite the well-established existence of this requirement before mandamus will be granted. *See, e.g., Will* v. *United States, supra; United States* v. *Smith,* 331 U.S. 469 (1947); *De Beers Consol. Mines Ltd. v. United States,* 325 U.S. 212, 217 (1945); *Ex parte United States,* 287 U.S. 241 (1932); *Ex parte United States,* 242 U.S. 27 (1916); *United States* v. *Mayer,* 235 U.S. 55. We also recognize that the language of *Will* carries a third possibility: when this Court stated "We need not decide under what circumstances, if any, such a use of mandamus would be appropriate", 389 U.S. 90, 96, the Circuit Court in this case may have believed such language to suggest that this Court intended to reserve decisions on such matters to the Circuit Courts. We frankly doubt that such was this Court's intent; the sentence preceding his quotation in *Will* certainly suggests strong disapproval by this Court of the use of mandamus under such circumstances. Yet the question of ". . .under what circumstances, if any, such a use of mandamus would be appropriate", 389 U.S. 90, 96, has been raised by the Court of Appeals' opinion in this case. This Court should define the ". . . circumstances, if any, . . ." justifying mandamus and not leave it to Circuit Courts, especially those writing without opinion, to review such interlocutory procedural orders. As we will demonstrate, in the present case, the consequence of leaving undefined such ". . . circumstances, if any, . . ." raises serious questions regarding the power of Federal District Courts and the concomitant rights of defendants such as Petitioners-Defendants in this case.

In short, the Court of Appeals in this case sought to extend *Will* to review of an interlocutory procedural order in a criminal case which could not conceivably have had the effect of a dismissal. If, in fact, *Will* no longer governs such cases, this Court should grant certiorari and write new guidelines. Alternatively, if *Will* still governs the use of mandamus to review interlocutory procedural orders in criminal cases, this Court should so state and/or should require that Courts of Appeal justify apparent deviation from *Will's* requirements in written opinions.

II. A federal district court should have the power, free from interference by interlocutory mandamus, to order the appointment of counsel in a criminal case.

A primary ground for the District Court's appointment of counsel in these cases was Petitioner King's concern that selective service defendants required legal counsel in deciding whether to accept President Ford's offer of clemency. (Appendix F, p. 6a.) Yet when the deadline for enrollment in the clemency program passed on March 31, 1975, the Government continued to press for issuance of a writ of mandamus.

We submit that imminency of the deadline for enrollment in the clemency program was the only consideration which could support the Court of Appeals' grant of extraordinary relief and when that deadline passed, there was nothing about these cases that could not first be presented for resolution in the District Court and litigated like any other criminal case.[4]

---

[4] Implicitly, the Government agrees with this position since it acknowledged that a direct appeal could be taken from any order for suppression or dismissal entered as a result of the Government's failure to comply with the order for discovery. Petition for Mandamus, pp. 6-7.

By granting the petition for mandamus on June 25, 1975, after expiration of the clemency program, the Court of Appeals acted in the apparent absence of any need for extraordinary relief. More significantly, by doing so without issuing a written opinion, the Court of Appeals left unsettled the question of the Petitioner King's power to appoint counsel or to take any action in the selective service cases remaining on the District Court's docket.

Admittedly, it is the order granting discovery, and not the original appointing order, that is the focus of consideration herein. However, if a District Court's power to appoint counsel is to constitute anything more than a meaningless ritual which the Government can counteract by interlocutory mandamus, then the existence of that appointing power necessarily implies that appointed counsel can perform some functions.[5]

A second purpose for the appointing order was the District Court's legitimate inquiry as to the status of pending criminal cases.

> Courts have (at least in the absence of legislation to the contrary) inherent power to provide themselves with appropriate instruments required for the performance of their duties. This power includes authority to appoint persons unconnected with the court to aid judges in the performance of specific judicial duties, as they may arise in the progress of a cause.
>
> *Ex parte Peterson*, 253 U.S. 300, 312, 313 (1920).

---

[5] For example, examination of the indictment and selective service file might disclose a basis for a stipulated dismissal of the prosecution in light of an obvious procedural error, as it did in the case of Defendant McKenna.

The Government has argued that because the defendants are "fugitives," appointed counsel have no standing to represent them.[6]

This attempt to brand the defendants as "fugitives," based solely upon a failure to apprehend them, may well have legal significance in some situations; however, in the present cases, it has served only as a circular argument to prevent the defendants, their court-appointed counsel, and the District Court from taking any steps to evaluate or resolve their actual present status.

Not all of the defendants are necessarily "fugitives," despite the Government's assertion. Indeed, in many of those cases where contacts have been made and authorizations obtained, the defendants either have previously surrendered to federal authorities or have been entirely unaware of their indictments and the reasons therefor. The only feasible way for appointed counsel to locate and contact their remaining clients to determine their status is through access to the addresses and other biographical information which is contained in the selective service files.

Yet, by presuming fugitive status and using that presumption as a claimed basis to prevent appointed counsel from obtaining access to the files, the Government thereby ensures its ability to continue pending

---

[6] The Government has undercut its own position by asserting that with written authorizations, counsel could have access to the selective service files. And in the Second Circuit, the Government stated that it would not object to appointed counsel's filing of motions attacking the indictments of absent defendants so long as counsel obtained written authorizations from their clients. *United States* v. *Weinstein, supra.*

prosecutions free from any supervision or review by the District Court.

We submit, however, that the District Court has the power to inquire into the status of criminal cases pending on its docket and is in no way required to share the Government's conclusive presumption regarding the fugitive status of all such defendants.

Additionally, an obvious implication of the Court's power to appoint counsel for a defendant is the necessity and obligation for counsel to contact their clients; these tasks of defense counsel do not evaporate merely because a client's whereabouts may be unknown or because the Government presumes to know the intent and reasons for the client's absence.

Thus, the Government's refusal to open its selective service files to appointed counsel is, in fact an effort to frustrate counsel's fulfillment of *any* functions in behalf of their clients. More importantly, in the absence of clearer guidelines from the Court of Appeals, issuance of the writ of mandamus herein raises serious questions about the power of the District Court to make any appointments or take any steps to supervise or affect the status of criminal cases on its own docket.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, certiorari should be granted and this Court should either reaffirm the holding of *Will* v. *United States, supra*, or write new standards governing the issuance of an interlocutory order in a criminal case (where such order does not result in a dismissal). In the alternative, upon a

grant of *certiorari*, this Court should remand the case to the Court of Appeals for a written opinion.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS L. MUI[7]
1131 Pacific Trade Center
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Attorney for Petitioners
United States District Court
and Samuel P. King,
District Judge

DAVID BETTENCOURT
JOHN S. EDMUNDS
ERIC A. SEITZ
Suite 402, 225 Queen Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Attorneys for Petitioners
Kurt Boyer, et al.

[7] Counsel for Petitioners United States District Court and Samuel P. King, District Judge, acknowledges preparation of this Petition by John S. Edmunds and Eric A. Seitz, attorneys for Petitioners, Real Parties in Interest, and concurs in all positions taken herein. This method of filing the Petition was followed to avoid duplication and repetition, for the convenience of this Court.

APPENDIX A

[Filed January 2, 1975]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 75-1061

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Petitioner*,

v.

U. S. DISTRICT COURT FOR HAWAII, *Respondent*,
KURT BOYER, ET AL., *Real Parties in Interest*.

Order

Before: KOELSCH and WRIGHT, Circuit Judges.

On consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus filed herein on January 10, 1975, it is

ORDERED that said Petition be and is DENIED.

APPENDIX B

[Filed February 13, 1975]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 75-1061

[Caption omitted in printing]

Order

Before: KOELSCH and WRIGHT, Circuit Judges.

Through inadvertence, the court on January 22, 1975, caused to be entered an order peremptorily denying the Petition of the United States for writ of mandate.

Accordingly, said order is vacated and annulled, and the court now makes this order:

Upon due consideration of the Petition of the United States of America for a writ of mandate, it is hereby ORDERED:

(1) That the clerk shall serve a copy of this order upon the interested district court judge and all parties to the action below. Such service shall be made by mail, and service on the parties may be effected by mailing copies of the parties' attorneys of record in the district court.

(2) Answers to the petition will be filed according to the provisions of Rule 21(b), Fed. R. App. P., and they will be filed within 14 days of the date this order is entered.

(3) Petitioner may file, within 28 days of the date this order is entered, a reply to any answers which may be filed.

(4) If the court shall require oral argument, the time for such argument will be subsequently fixed and the parties notified.

A TRUE COPY
FEB. 20, 1975
ATTEST
EMIL E. MELFI, JR., *Clerk*
by
S. WHITE, *Deputy*

APPENDIX C

[Filed April 30, 1975]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 75-1061

[Caption omitted in printing]

Order

Before: CHAMBERS and KOELSCH, Circuit Judges

Upon due consideration, the Court requests all parties to submit simultaneously further briefs on the effect on this case of the lapse of the Clemency Program within 21 days of the date of entry of this order. Upon the expiration of the 28 days from date, the petition goes to the regular weekly motions panel.

APPENDIX D

[Filed June 25, 1975]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 75-1061

[Caption omitted in printing]

Order

Before: GOODWIN and WALLACE, Circuit Judges

Upon due consideration, the writ of mandamus is granted and the district court is ordered to vacate its order of December 16, 1974.

/s/ ALFRED T. GOODWIN
/s/ J. CLIFFORD WALLACE
U. S. Circuit Judges

APPENDIX E

[Filed August 18, 1975]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 75-1061

[Caption omitted in printing]

Order

Before: GOODWIN and WALLACE, Circuit Judges.

The panel as constituted in the above case has voted to deny the petition for rehearing and to reject the suggestion for rehearing en banc.

The full court has been advised of the suggestion for en banc rehearing, and no judge of the court has requested a vote on the suggestion for rehearing en banc. Fed. R. App. P. 35(b).

The petition for rehearing is denied, and the suggestion for a rehearing en banc is rejected.

APPENDIX F

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Cr. No. 12324
UNITED STATES v. KURT BOYER

Cr. No. 12350
UNITED STATES v. RENE CRISANTO LICHAUCO

Cr. No. 12391
UNITED STATES v. RUSSELL FRANKLIN BARNETT, JR.

Cr. No. 12415
UNITED STATES v. MICHAEL PAUL MEYER

Cr. No. 12560
UNITED STATES v. TRACY ALEXANDER ROTH

Cr. No. 12567
UNITED STATES v. WILLIAM MARK MCKENNA

Cr. No. 12666
UNITED STATES v. JEFFERY FRED CHOY HEE

Cr. No. 12814
UNITED STATES v. DAVID CASTLE WOOLLEY

Cr. No. 13062
UNITED STATES v. ROBERT WALLACE ALLEN

Cr. No. 13111
UNITED STATES v. WALLACE ISAMU AKUTAGAWA

Cr. No. 13115
UNITED STATES v. MITCHELL ANDREW MCCONNELL

Cr. No. 13263
UNITED STATES v. DAVID PAUL TURLEY

Cr. No. 13264
UNITED STATES v. THOMAS LEONARD BARTHEL, III

Cr. No. 74-115
UNITED STATES v. JOHN JOSEPH YIZNITSKY

Cr. No. 74-116
UNITED STATES v. JEFFERY ERNEST HEYNS

Memorandum and Order

In each of the above fifteen Selective Service cases pending before this Court, the defendants have been indicted

but the prosecutions have not gone forward because the defendants are allegedly fugitives. As a result of their status no defense counsel have been representing them. In view of current events this lack of legal representation may prejudice their positions.

The Court takes judicial notice of the fact that the President has announced and the Department of Justice and Department of Defense have implemented, an amnesty program that may affect the rights of these defendants and thousands of others who are similarly situated.

Accordingly, David Bettencourt, Esq., and John Edmunds, Esq., and Eric A. Seitz, Esq., members of the Bar of this Court who are experienced in matters relating to the Selective Service laws, are appointed to represent these defendants in connection with the charges pending against the defendants in the referenced criminal cass involving violations of 50 U.S.C. § 462. The appointed attorneys shall consult with the United States Attorney and report the status of each case to this Court on December 16, 1974, at 1:30 o'clock P.M.

The Clerk of this Court shall mail a copy of this Memorandum and Order to each defendant at his last known address. Correspondence from a defendant will be received; in the absence of a defendant his relative or next best friend will be heard on his behalf.

So ordered.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii. November 6, 1974.

/s/ (Illegible)
United States District Judge

/s/ SAMUEL P. KING
United States District Judge

APPENDIX G

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

[Caption omitted in printing]

Order Granting Motion for Discovery

Defendants' Motion for Discovery, having come on for hearing before this Court on December 16, 1974, the Court having heard arguments of counsel for the parties, and good cause appearing therefor

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that said Motion is granted and the Office of the United States Attorney shall comply on or before January 3, 1975.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, December 18, 1974.

/s/ SAMUEL P. KING
Judge Samuel P. King
Judge of the above-entitled Court

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

No. 75-719

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

Petitioners contend that the district court is entitled to appoint counsel to represent fugitive defendants in criminal cases without the defendants' knowledge, consent or participation, and to order discovery against the government in such cases. Petitioners also contend that the court of appeals is without power to issue a writ of mandamus directing the district court to vacate the order allowing discovery.

On November 6, 1974, the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii issued an order appointing three attorneys to represent some fifteen individuals who had been indicted for selective service violations but who had subsequently become fugitives (Pet. App. 5a-6a).

The appointed counsel filed a motion for discovery, seeking to inspect the selective service files of the individuals

in question. The government opposed this motion, arguing that the attorneys had not been retained or authorized by the individuals to represent them. The district court granted the motion on December 18, 1974 (Pet. App. 7a).

The government then sought writs of mandamus and prohibition, requesting the court of appeals to vacate the discovery order and to direct the district court to cease entertaining motions raised by the appointed attorneys. On January 22, 1975, the court of appeals denied the petition (Pet. App. 1a). It vacated the denial on February 13, and on June 25, 1975, it granted the petition for a writ of mandamus and directed the district court to vacate its discovery order (Pet. App. 2a, 3a).

1. Petitioners contest the revocation of the district court's discovery order, but this Court recently has denied certiorari in an identical case. *United States* v. *Weinstein*, 511 F.2d 622 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied *sub nom. Austin* v. *United States*, 422 U.S. 1042, rehearing denied, October 6, 1975. As we pointed out in our brief in that case,[1] the defendants on whose behalf the petition was filed are fugitives, who are not entitled "to call upon the resources of [this] Court for determination of [their] claims." *Molinaro* v. *New Jersey*, 396 U.S. 365, 366. Beyond that, as the court of appeals held in *Weinstein, supra*, 511 F.2d at 628, a district court possesses no legitimate authority in our adversary system to appoint counsel to represent and make motions on behalf of fugitive defendants who have not authorized such representation.[2]

2. Relying on *Will* v. *United States*, 389 U.S. 90, petitioners also contend that mandamus does not lie to correct

---

[1]A copy of our response in *Austin*, No. 74-1170, is being furnished to counsel for petitioners.

[2]There is a serious question here, as there was in *Weinstein*, whether counsel for the individual fugitives are authorized to file a petition. We pretermit that question here, however, because the district court and Judge King are properly before this Court.

the errors committed by the district court. *Will* was decided at a time when the government's rights of appeal in criminal cases were narrowly circumscribed and was, we submit, very much a product of the Court's concern that mandamus not become a means of subverting the congressional policy against government appeals. That policy has been completely reversed by Congress (see *United States* v. *Wilson*, 420 U.S. 332, 339), and we think the underpinnings of *Will's* restrictive views of the availability of mandamus to the government in criminal cases have thus been largely removed. In any event, *Will* contemplated the use of mandamus in "circumstances amounting to a judicial 'usurpation of power' " (389 U.S. at 95). Mandamus has often been used when interlocutory orders in criminal cases establish such judicial usurpation. As the court held in *Weinstein* in identical circumstances (511 F.2d at 626):

> We believe this to be one of those rare, *sui generis* cases in which unique circumstances require that the writ be granted. For reasons noted below, we are satisfied that the district judge has clearly exceeded his powers. Issuance of the writ will not affect any defendant's constitutional right to a speedy trial, since each is a long-time fugitive who has not sought trial but, on the contrary, by fleeing the jurisdiction, has prevented his case from being brought promptly to trial.[3]

---

[3]Petitioners attempt to distinguish *Weinstein*, arguing that because the district court in that case had entertained motions by the appointed attorneys to dismiss the indictments, the government's mandamus petition directed to those motions would have been proper. But the motions to dismiss in *Weinstein* were denied by the district judge and were not the subject of the mandamus petition. There, as here, the government asked that the discovery orders be vacated and that the district court be ordered to cease hearing any motions on behalf of defendants who had not authorized the representation.

See also *United States* v. *McMillen*, 489 F.2d 229 (C.A. 7); *United States* v. *DeLeon*, 498 F.2d 1327 (C.A. 7); *United States* v. *Carter*, 493 F.2d 704 (C.A. 2); *United States* v. *Dooling*, 406 F.2d 192 (C.A. 2); *United States Board of Parole* v. *Merhige*, 487 F.2d 25 (C.A. 4), certiorari denied, 417 U.S. 918.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

ROBERT H. BORK,
Solicitor General.

FEBRUARY 1976.